

und Ortsregister sowie eine ausführliche Zeittafel beigegeben. Mit der Wiedergabe von Bildern ist man sparsam gewesen. Um so mehr sind sie als willkommene Ergänzungen zum Text zu begrüßen. Mit Ausnahme der alten Stiche oder der Münzen werden fast alle Bilder, besonders die Porträts, farbig wiedergegeben. Der bemerkenswerte Inhalt des Buches wird somit auch in einer gediegenen Ausstattung dargeboten.

Conradin Bonorand, Chur

Wilhelm H. Neuser, Die reformatorische Wende bei Zwingli, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1977, 160 S., Paperback, DM 29.—.

The author has produced an important study of Zwingli's development as a religious thinker from 1513 to 1521, as well as his retrospective appraisals of this development ("Selbstzeugnisse") from 1521 to 1527. He has shown that a wider collection of sources is pertinent to Zwingli's emergence as a Reformer than previous scholars recognized. In this respect his work is a definite advance upon that of Arthur Rich, whose conclusions he substantially affirms but whose argumentation he criticizes as being based upon an "over-interpretation" of Zwingli's marginalia. Moreover, Neuser's book is marked by a fertility of hypothesis which will properly occupy scholars who cannot accept all of his conclusions.

The basic issue about Zwingli's beginnings as a Reformer was raised by his dogged insistence upon his independence from Luther, that he "began to preach the Gospel of Christ in 1516", before he or his friends had heard of Luther. Such a claim has been regarded with suspicion because of Zwingli's obvious interest in minimizing his connection with Luther: both in the years before Zurich had adopted the Reformation, when association with Luther might have led to suppression of Zwingli's preaching, and then after 1525, when Luther and he were at swords' point in the eucharistic controversy. Clearly, Zwingli belonged to the group of Erasmian Christian humanists in the period from 1515 to the Reformation, a point stressed equally by Arthur Rich, Walther Köhler and J. F. Gerhard Goeters. As long ago as the 1919 Reformation anniversary Köhler objected that Zwingli's claims to an independent beginning as a Reformer amounted to an incapacity to distinguish between humanism and the Reformation. Later, however, Köhler stressed the significance of Zwingli's independent appropriation of Augustine in the beginnings of the Zurich Reformation, a point reinforced by Rich's attempt to show that Zwingli shaped a Reformation soteriology through independent study of Augustine in 1520 and 1521. Such an interpretation safeguarded Zwingli's independence of Luther while distinguishing between his periods as Christian humanist and Reformer. On the contrary, such major Zwingli scholars as Oskar Farnet and Gottfried W. Locher have underscored the firmness and consistency of Zwingli's own view that the Reformation began when he turned to the Bible and *solus Christus* in 1516. Locher's view has been that Zwingli's commitment to Christ and the Bible quickly became deeper than that of Erasmus, and that it is a distortion to regard Zwingli as an "Erasmian". Locher would accept Rich's view that Zwingli's mature soteriology emerged in 1520/1521 but nevertheless affirm Zwingli's judgment that 1516 was the moment of genuine significance, the beginning of his career as Reformer.

Neuser demonstrates that virtually everything Zwingli wrote about his past had some kind of apologetic objective. He points out that Zwingli minimized his connection with Erasmus after breaking with him in 1523, just as he denied dependence upon Luther, and goes on to show to his satisfaction that Zwingli need not be taken

literally with respect to either man. In regard to Luther, he demonstrates that Zwingli was very well versed in Luther's writings of 1518 and 1519, and, more importantly, that Zwingli's *Auslegung der Schlußreden* (1523) shows a clear dependence with respect to the important conception of *testamentum* upon *De captivitate Babylonica* (1520). Neuser has pinpointed Zwingli's familiarity with Luther better than any previous scholar.

Neuser concludes that Zwingli "identifiziert ... unzutreffend religiösen Humanismus und Reformation, um nur von dem Verdacht der Abhängigkeit von Luther frei zu werden". He concedes that religious humanism was a "Vorbereitung" for what he conceives of as Zwingli's "reformatorische Entdeckung", and to that extent allows a historical, although not a theological, value to those Selbstzeugnisse in which Zwingli attempts to date the beginning of his career as a Reformer. Neuser attributes more theological value to those Selbstzeugnisse to which no date is attached. In the *Archeteles* (1522) Zwingli is candid about the gradual stages through which his Reformation program developed. In the *Auslegung der Schlußreden*, in Zwingli's discussion of his struggle to obtain assurance of God's mercy in the face of the dictum of the Lord's prayer: "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors", Neuser clearly feels that he has put his finger on Zwingli's equivalent to Luther's Turmerlebnis. He identifies the period referred to as Zwingli's study of the Psalms in early 1521 and concludes, against Rich and Köhler, that, rather than being Zwingli's Reformation mentor, Augustine only accentuated his despair at the crucial moment. Although Luther did not provide him with a key to the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer, his acquaintance with *De captivitate Babylonica* at that decisive period provided him with the key to his understanding of the Gospel as the "Word of promise".

Neuser's is a rich book. Its value consists not only in the major points alluded to here, but also in many smaller ones emerging from his careful study of the sources. Zwingli's prominent role in the composition of *Die göttliche Mühle* (1521) is one example. Another is his explanation that Zwingli's opposition to the claims that the tithe was based upon divine law was a resistance to extorting tithes by threats of excommunication—this subject has been much misunderstood in studies of the Anabaptist schism in the Zurich Reformation.

Nevertheless the book is based upon some rigid presuppositions. The most important is that Christian humanism and the Reformation are *essentially* different. Neuser is perplexed by Zwingli's inability to see that difference, which he renders more understandable to himself by finding a similar false consciousness in Calvin, who also thought he joined the Reformation when he turned to the Holy Scriptures, rather than when he arrived at specifically Protestant doctrinal formulations. This insistence upon propositional theological criteria for a "reformatorische Entdeckung" fits well with Neuser's total acceptance of the Bizer dating of Luther's Turmerlebnis and his references to the *theologia crucis* as "Luthers frühe, mystische Theologie". Zwingli and Calvin themselves were much closer to the view that Erasmus took in his last important pre-Reformation theological controversy with the Louvain scholastic Latomus, namely that true theology consisted in an immersion in sacred letters in their integrity, rather than in regarding them as the shell bark surrounding theological truths which were expressible in propositions suitable for a scholastic disputation. Luther with his scholastic background saw matters differently than Zwingli the humanist. One of Neuser's enlightening particular stresses is that Zwingli eventually concluded that the contemporaries to whom he owed most were neither Luther nor Erasmus but the Erasmians, the "*virī multi et*

*excellentes*” with whom he corresponded about the rebirth of Christendom, and many of whom continued as Reformed leaders in Switzerland and South Germany (e.g. Leo Jud, Wolfgang Capito, Joachim Vadian). But then Neuser adds the strained interpretation that, like some Barthian before his time, Zwingli credited these men with mere knowledge of religion while he and Luther had received the Gospel. The rigidity of Neuser’s interpretive framework leads him to some improbable judgments, as when he is forced to try to see the *Göttliche Vermahnung* (1522) to Schwyz as a Reformation writing of Zwingli’s, somehow distinct from his earlier Erasmian pacifism. The insistence that Christian humanism and the Reformation were different for Reformers who insisted that they were a single, continuous entity amounts to assigning them a “false consciousness”. The danger is that, in insisting that we understand the Reformers better than they understood themselves, we intrude upon them with alien interpretive categories. For Neuser, the insistence that Zwingli had a “reformatorische Entdeckung” of the same content as Luther’s, and recognizably similar to the beliefs of a school of twentieth-century Protestant theologians, leads to the astonishing conclusion that Zwingli “vergisst . . . die Begegnung mit Luthers Worttheologie”. Neuser has written a book full of valuable insights; they threaten more than once to break out of the shell of the author’s presuppositions. Must Christian humanism always be left behind by the Reformation? Did all Reformers make the same “reformatorische Entdeckung”?

*James M. Stayer, Kingstons, Ontario*

Bullinger-Tagung 1975, Vorträge, gehalten aus Anlaß von Heinrich Bullingers 400. Todestag. Im Auftrag des Instituts für Schweizerische Reformationgeschichte hg. von *Ulrich Gäbler* und *Endre Zsindely*, Zürich, Institut für Schweizerische Reformationgeschichte, 1977, brosch., 142 S.

Am 17. September 1975 waren seit dem Tod Heinrich Bullingers vierhundert Jahre vergangen. Das Institut für Schweizerische Reformationgeschichte der Universität Zürich veröffentlichte aus diesem Anlaß die zwei Bände «Heinrich Bullinger 1504–1575, Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag» und führte vom 29. September bis 1. Oktober 1975 eine wissenschaftliche Tagung durch. Die dabei gehaltenen Vorträge liegen jetzt in «Bullinger-Tagung 1975» vor; sie bieten eine wichtige Ergänzung zu den gesammelten Aufsätzen, obwohl vermutlich aus Rücksicht auf die Druckkosten keine Anmerkungen mit Quellen- und Literaturhinweisen beigefügt wurden. Die Vorträge befassen sich mit Bullinger als Seelsorger und praktischem Theologen, mit theologischen Aspekten, mit seiner Stellung in der zürcherischen politischen Wirklichkeit und mit der Forschungslage.

Zunächst notiert *Endre Zsindely* in «Heinrich Bullinger als Seelsorger», daß Bullinger während 44 Jahren Pfarrer an Zürichs größter Kirche und zugleich Leiter der Zürcher Kirche gewesen sei. Damit ist die Spannweite seines Wirkens angegeben. Als Seelsorge wurde in der Reformationszeit «offenbar die gesamte Tätigkeit eines Pfarrers» verstanden. Als Quellen erwähnt Zsindely die Briefe, Erinnerungen von Zeitgenossen, Bücher und andere Schriften Bullingers. Der Vortrag entwirft ein eindrückliches Bild seines pastoralen Wirkens bei Eheproblemen, in der Betreuung der Kranken und Sterbenden, der Gefangenen und der zum Tode Verurteilten, in der Beratung von Diplomaten und Fürsten, von Amtsbrüdern; «Seelsorge hatte in der Reformationszeit kaum jemand nötiger als die Theologen selbst». Diese Thematik findet ihre Fortsetzung im Vortrag des in Cluj (Klausenburg) lehrenden *István Tökés* über «Bullinger als praktischer Theologe». Er betont, daß «im theologischen